

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: In last

Cardinal's SRs an explanation was offered of why the Catholicism of the past century, as perceived by Catholics who expressed ourselves during a recent school controversy happened to be in what the recent Papal document proves to have been the wrong side. Briefly put, the Catholicism of the past century was perceived to have been brought up in a school of neoology, and did not realize either this fact or that there were other schools within the Catholic Church. Secondly, they forgot, or forgot to justify, the existence of the school of neoology by assuming to themselves, unconsciously and without formal intent, but purely out of love for right doctrine, the functions of the universal Church. Thirdly, they forgot to justify the position of the recent discussion—the respective rights of the Church and the State in lay education—outside of the region of probabilism and within that of doctrinal certainty.¹

It is not surprising, therefore, that the reader of neoology without realizing how hard and unsettled many points concerning the *approaches* of Church and State are. There is the fundamental principle that we have, its application to the human natural order, which is supreme; the State has as its temporal good, the Church with an eternal; but man is the common subject of both; with

him, as a member of the body politic, deals the State, and with him, as ordained to eternal life, deals the Church. This fact makes the application of the universally admitted principle that each has rights in this common possession, an extremely difficult matter practically. Of course, the problems in the matter are not nearly so many or puzzling to-day as they were 600 years ago; experience has been wonderful enlightener. In fact, historical de-

[illegible][illegible][illegible]